

# **Program Evaluation Survey**

---

## **CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THIS PROGRAM**

- |                                                |                                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>1. County</b>                               | Santa Clara                                                        |
| <b>2. Program Name</b>                         | Restorative Justice Demonstration (3 sites)                        |
| <b>3. Mailing Address</b>                      | Probation Department, 840 Guadalupe Parkway, San Jose,<br>CA 95110 |
| <b>4. Research Manager</b>                     | Danielle Kelly                                                     |
| <b>5. Research Manager's Phone</b>             | (408) 278-5917                                                     |
| <b>6. Person responsible for Data Tracking</b> | Mary Pat Panighetti                                                |
| <b>7. Phone/Fax of Data Tracker</b>            | 408-278-6062 <b>FAX</b> 408-294-1872                               |
| <b>8. Contract Researcher(s)</b>               | Dr. Willie Ellison and Dr. Peter Ellis<br>408-271-7049             |

## **THE PROGRAM**

### **9. Briefly describe interventions that will be used in this program.**

Santa Clara County will implement a restorative justice system in three treatment communities with a youth population of 33,472. The project will provide restorative justice interventions of neighborhood accountability boards, day reporting centers, and youth competency programs to build pro-social behavior in 2,300 youth from the three communities. The intervention will also work with the entire community and its community service providers to practice community oriented problem solving, to reduce risk factors, and to increase protective factors and assets found in the community.

### **10. Briefly describe, in general terms, the expected beneficial effects of the program (especially the benefits as they relate to what you are going to measure; e.g., if the primary dependent variable is "grade point average," then the goal would be to improve the grade point average.**

The beneficial effects of the program on the treatment community will be measured by comparing the treatment communities to the comparison communities in the following areas:

[Note: The goals of the program for the treatment community will be measured by comparing the treatment communities to the comparison communities and, where data exists, by comparing the treatment communities to their historical data (\*indicates such data exists)]

- Reduction in the number of arrests and referrals to formal Juvenile Justice System.\*
- Higher rate of successful completion of probation.
- Greater number of hours of community service work completed.
- Improvement in protective and resiliency factors in the youth who participate in the demonstration project's Accountability Restorative Track (pre-post assessment; treatment communities only)
- Improvement in competency development skills in the youth who participate in the demonstration project's Accountability Restorative Track (pre-post assessment; treatment communities only)
- Higher rate of victim restoration for crime victims.
- Reduced number of youth of color in the ranches and juvenile hall.\*
- Improvement in community's perceptions of safety, juvenile accountability, swift sanctions, youth protective factors, and opportunities for youth.

- Decrease in community's perception of youth crime, youth violence, gang activity, domestic violence, child abuse, access to guns, and access to drugs.
- Reduction in neighborhood risk factors for youth (pre-post assessment; treatment communities only)
- Lower run away and failure rate of youth's from the Ranches.\*
- Lower referral rate to the California Youth Authority.\*

**11. Name and briefly describe the type of research design that you intend to use to determine whether or not this program produces the desired outcomes.**

A quasi-experimental design wherein communities that receive treatment interventions (i.e., treatment communities ) are compared to comparable communities (i.e., comparison communities) that do not.

**12. Briefly describe the process evaluation research that you intend to conduct.**

The process evaluation will describe in both the comparison and treatment communities the types of services that were provided to youth. The services will be described by indicating Inputs, Process, and Outputs of services provided in both treatment and comparison communities. The review will document accountability and competency development services operating in each community: Inputs - compare and contrast inputs. Describe the inputs operating in the community to address youth related problems. Process - Compare and contrast process. Describe how the Restorative Project;s inputs and activities operated in the community and compare to comparison community. Outputs - Compare and contrast outputs and level of services. The total amount of services provided by the Project to the community will be documented along with a cost per unit of services and compare to comparison community cost per unit of service.

**COMPARISON GROUP**

**13. Will there be a comparison group?**

Yes

**14. If you answered 'no' to #13, how will the effectiveness of the program be evaluated?**

N/A

**15. Will the treatment and comparison group subjects be randomly assigned from the same pool of subjects?**

No

**16. If you answered 'no' to #15, what kind of comparison group will you use?**

Comparison communities (3) that are known "child poverty zones" and that are similar to the treatment communities with respect to ethnic populations, child abuse rates, crime rates, economic characteristics, and other demographics. There are 32,125 youth in the comparison communities.

**17. Briefly describe the process for identifying and assigning the comparison group subjects.**

Comparison communities were identified on the basis of existing demographic information.

**18. List the criteria for participation that must be met by the comparison group subjects (e.g., age, probation status, gender). Next to each, list the level of the variable that will be used for subject selection (e.g., age 12 or higher, ward of the probation department, males).**

0-19 years old and living in the 3 comparison communities. Adults & service providers in the comparison communities will be randomly surveyed at months 2 & 35.

**19. List any other independent variables that you will be collecting for the comparison group (e.g., risk assessment score, legal history, grade point average, school attendance, drug use).**

None

**20. Will the comparison group be matched to the treatment group in terms of any variables?**

Yes

**21. If you answered 'yes' to #20, list the matching variables that will be used.**

Community-level data with respect to ethnicity, child abuse rates, crime rates, economic characteristics and other demographics.

**22. If you answered 'yes' to #20, briefly describe how the comparison group will be matched to the treatment group.**

Comparison communities (3) will be selected that closely "match" the treatment communities with respect to the matching variables.

**23. If you answered 'no' to #20, briefly describe why you believe that the treatment and comparison groups will possess the necessary comparability.**

N/A

**24. How many subjects will participate in the comparison group during the entire course of the program?**

All youth under age 20 who live in the (3) comparison communities (N=32,125). Additionally, 100 service providers and 1200 adults from the comparison communities. All youth unde

**TREATMENT GROUP**

**25. Briefly describe the process for identifying and assigning treatment-group subjects.**

Treatment communities are selected "child poverty zones" with known ethnic populations, child abuse rates, crime rates, economic characteristics and other demographics. Outcome data will be collected on all youth under age 20 who reside in the treatment communities. Within the treatment communities, age 10-17 youths who are referred by citation will participate in the Accountability Track and the Competency Development Track. A similar number of youth will participate in the Competency Development Track only.

**26. List the criteria for participation that must be met by the treatment group subjects (e.g., age, probation status, gender). Next to each, list the level of the variable that will be used for subject selection (e.g., age 12 or higher, ward of the probation department, males).**

0-19 years old and living in the treatment communities. For Accountability Track: age 10-17 and referred by citation. For Competency Development Track: Will vary by community.

**27. List any other independent variables that you will be collecting for treatment group (e.g., risk assessment score, legal history, grade point average, school attendance, drug use).**

Independent Variables = IV that will be tracked for 2,300 Accountability Board youths: (Note: \* indicates IV that it will also be tracked for the 2,300 additional youth who participate in Competency Development Programs)

1. Age\*; 2. Gender\*; 3. Ethnicity\*; 4. Type of Youth Served\* (Gang Affiliated Youth; Not Gang Affiliated Youth); 5. Number of Referrals to Juvenile Probation; 6. Level of Penetration Into Juvenile Justice System (Referral; Informal Probation; Formal Probation; Juvenile Hall Placement; Ranch Placement; Alternative Placement; CYA Placement); 7. Penetration of Family Members Into Justice System (Parent/Guardian; Siblings); 8. Number of Family Members in Home (Adults; Siblings); 9. Functioning of Home/Family (Chronic Major Family Dysfunction; Some Major Dysfunction; No Major Dysfunction); 10. School Attendance Status; 11. School Success Status; 12. Special Education Status; 13. Mayfair\*; 14. Alum Rock\*; 15. Burbank\*; 16. Gilroy\*; 17. Comparison Community.

"In Program" Independent Variables: 18. Youth Client Satisfaction of Services\*; 19. Parents Client Satisfaction of Services; 20. Service Providers Satisfaction of Service\*; 21. Evaluators Performance Appraisal of Services Provided\* (Staffs Understanding of Risk; Resiliency & Protective Factors; Acceptance of Youth by Program; Respect of Youth by Program; Structure of Program; Socialization of Youth; Effective Communication; Performance Compared to Goals; Effectiveness Compared to Outcomes; Implementation of Evaluation Requirements; Cost Effectiveness) 22. Hours of Client Service\*; 23. Cost Per Hour of Client Service\*; 24. Continuum of Service\* (Prevention; Intervention; Supervision; Treatment; Incarceration; After-care); 25. Competency Development Programs for Youth\* (Life Skills Support Group Program; Job Training Programs; After School Recreation/Social Development; Counseling Services; Drug & Alcohol Programs; Mentoring Services; Youth Leadership Programs; Youth Intervention Support Groups; Special School Programs); 26. Accountability (Neighborhood Accountability Board; Victim Restitution; Victim Restoration/Mediation; Community Service Work; Family Conferencing; Day Reporting Center); 27. School Resiliency Assets\* (Caring, Support & Structure; High Expectations; Participation); 28. Home Resiliency Assets\* (Caring, Support & Structure; High Expectations; Participation); 29. Community Resiliency Assets\* (Caring, Support & Structure; High Expectations; Participation); 30. Intervention Progress Variable (Participant Moved from Treatment Communities; Full, Partial, Limited, and Refused Participation)

**28. How many subjects will participate in the treatment evaluation research samples?**

All youth under age 20 who live in the treatment communities. Additionally, 2,300 youth in the Competency Development Track; 2,300 youth in both the Competency Development Track and the Accountability Track; 100 service providers and 1200 adults (all from within the treatment communities.)

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTIONS**

**29. List the interventions that only the treatment group will receive (interventions that are not received by the comparison group). Next to each intervention, state in measurable terms, the goals of the intervention. For example, a goal might be: "to improve reading level of program participants."**

The following are the interventions that only the treatment communities will receive:

- Neighborhood Accountability Boards.
- Day Reporting Centers.
- Family Conferencing Services as part of Accountability Boards.
- Additional Competency Development Programs available to youth who go through the Accountability Boards.
- Organized Restorative Justice community-based processes with trained organizers to assist community service providers in implementing a system of Restorative Justice.
- Restorative Justice Case Management Tracking Services.

(See pp 9 - 13 of grant proposal for details.)

All the services are expected to accomplish the following goals:

[Note: The goals of the program for the treatment community will be measured by comparing the treatment communities to the comparison communities and, where data exists, by comparing the treatment communities to their historical data (\*indicates such data exists)]

- Reduction in the number of arrests and referrals to formal Juvenile Justice System.\*
- Higher rate of successful completion of probation.
- Greater number of hours of community service work completed.
- Improvement in protective and resiliency factors in the youth who participate in the demonstration project's Accountability Restorative Track (pre-post assessment; treatment communities only)
- Improvement in competency development skills in the youth who participate in the demonstration project's Accountability Restorative Track (pre-post assessment; treatment communities only)
- Higher rate of victim restoration for crime victims.
- Reduced number of youth of color in the ranches and juvenile hall.\*
- Improvement in community's perceptions of safety, juvenile accountability, swift sanctions, youth protective factors, and opportunities for youth.
- Decrease in community's perception of youth crime, youth violence, gang activity, domestic violence, child abuse, access to guns, and access to drugs.
- Reduction in neighborhood risk factors for youth (pre-post assessment; treatment communities only)
- Lower run away and failure rate of youth's from the Ranches.\*
- Lower referral rate to the California Youth Authority.\*

**30. List the interventions that only the comparison group will receive (interventions that are not received by the treatment group).**

Comparison groups of youth will receive a variety of services. No attempt will be made to control the type of services provided the comparison group.

**31. List the interventions that both the treatment and comparison groups will receive (i.e., in what ways, in terms of interventions, will the treatment and control subjects be treated in the same).**

Treatment & comparison groups will receive many of the same services in the area of youth competence development programs, probation services, police services, social services, & health services, etc.